

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), distinguished chairman of our Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, having just arrived from a long airplane trip from Oregon, I can tell my colleagues that the eyes of the Pacific Northwest are upon us at this time.

The urgency, I know, has been identified here, but, for instance, Pakistan is on the verge of a purchase of some 350,000 metric tons of wheat. I am sure it has been identified that sanctions were never to include food purchases and even the unintended result was voiced by the administration when the President has introduced this and supported this kind of legislation.

So, without further ado, Mr. Speaker, we hope that we can rush this along, even move it to the other body within the hour and it can become law, a great benefit, by the way, to a great country that needs to sell wheat, the United States, and a great country, Pakistan, who, by the way, is buying wheat for half the price it paid last year. Both our benefits are met.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2282, the Agriculture Export Relief Act of 1998. This bill will allow our agriculture exporters to continue to sell food and fertilizer to India and Pakistan, both of whom are subject to sanctions under the Arms Export Control Act for conducting nuclear tests.

Let's be clear here. This is not an argument about either of these countries conducting nuclear tests and raising tensions in this region of the world. I deplore their unilateral decisions to conduct tests, and urge both countries to comply with the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. But, without this legislation, our farmers will be shut out of these growing export markets, unable to sell their products, and thus unable to meet their own financial obligations. This could lead to job losses and bankruptcies throughout rural America.

The sad truth is that we created this problem ourselves. We enacted a sanctions law with noble purposes—among them stopping the spread of nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, this law, like most laws imposing unilateral sanctions, didn't work. It didn't stop India and Pakistan from nuclear testing. Yet our farmers and ranchers continue to pay the price.

Unfortunately, this Congress seems to be far more willing to impose unilateral economic sanctions as the foreign policy solution to practically all of our international problems. And the fact is—they rarely work! When we pull out of a foreign market or refuse to trade with foreign countries our foreign competitors love it! U.S. products are quickly and easily replaced by foreign goods while U.S. business is forced to stand on the sidelines. And, unfortunately, unilateral sanctions rarely result in the political changes we want.

Now I am not saying that economic sanctions should never be imposed. They can be an effective tool of foreign policy, particularly when applied selectively and multilaterally. Be we in Congress should remember that they are just a tool—not the ultimate solution.

I would urge my colleagues to support this bill. I also hope many of you will take a hard look at a measure introduced by myself, Representative HAMILTON and Representative CRANE—the Enhancement of Trade, Security, and Human Rights through Sanctions Reform Act. Our legislation would not stop Congress from imposing sanctions, but would require a careful analysis of sanctions' costs and benefits before they are imposed. It would provide a rational, reasoned approach to our sanctions policy to help make sure that we do not find ourselves once again in the difficult situation we are trying to fix today.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2282, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Comprehensive National Energy Strategy (Strategy) to the Congress. This report required by section 801 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91; 42 U.S.C. 7321(b)), highlights our national energy policy. It contains specific objectives and plans for meeting five essential, common sense goals enumerated in the accompanying message from Secretary Peña.

Energy is a global commodity of strategic importance. It is also a key contributor to our economic performance, and its production and use affect the environment in many ways. Thus, affordable, adequate, and environmentally benign supplies of energy are critical to our Nation's economic, environmental, and national security.

The Strategy reflects the emergence and interconnection of three pre-eminent challenges in the late 1990s: how to maintain energy security in increasingly globalized energy markets; how to harness competition in energy markets both here and abroad; and how to respond to local and global environmental concerns, including the threat of climate change. The need for research and development underlies the Strategy, which incorporates recommendations of my Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) for improvements in energy

technologies that will enable the United States to address our energy-related challenges. Advances in energy technology can strengthen our economy, reduce our vulnerability to oil shocks, lower the cost of energy to consumers, and cut emissions of air pollutants as well as greenhouse gases.

This Strategy was developed over several months in an open process. Three public hearings were held earlier this year in California, Texas, and Washington, D.C., and more than 300 public comments were received. This Strategy is not a static document; its specifics can be modified to reflect evolving conditions, while the framework provides policy guidance into the 21st century. My Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to implement the Strategy and to achieve its goals in the most effective manner possible.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 14, 1998.

□ 1730

26TH ANNUAL REPORT ON FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES, FISCAL YEAR 1997—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

To the Congress of the United States:

As provided by the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), as amended (Public Law 92-463; 5 U.S.C. App. 2, 6(c)), I am submitting the *Twenty-sixth Annual Report on Federal Advisory Committees*, covering fiscal year 1997.

Consistent with my commitment to create a more responsive government, the executive branch continues to implement my policy of maintaining the number of advisory committees within the ceiling of 534 required by Executive Order 12838 of February 10, 1993. As a result, the number of discretionary advisory committees (established under general congressional authorizations) was held to 467, or 42 percent fewer than those 801 committees in existence at the beginning of my Administration.

Through the advisory committee planning process required by Executive Order 12838, the total number of advisory committees specifically mandated by statute has declined. The 391 such groups supported at the end of fiscal year 1997 represents a 4 percent decrease over the 407 in existence at the end of fiscal year 1996. Compared to the 439 advisory committees mandated by statute at the beginning of my Administration, the net total for fiscal year 1997 reflects an 11 percent decrease since 1993.

Furthermore, my Administration will assure that the total estimated